

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 29, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 53 Leg.]

YEAS—71

Abraham	Fitzgerald	Lott
Allard	Frist	Lugar
Ashcroft	Gorton	Mack
Bayh	Graham	McConnell
Bennett	Gramm	Moynihan
Biden	Grams	Nickles
Bingaman	Grassley	Robb
Bond	Gregg	Roberts
Brownback	Hagel	Rockefeller
Bryan	Hatch	Roth
Bunning	Helms	Santorum
Burns	Hollings	Schumer
Campbell	Hutchinson	Sessions
Cochran	Hutchison	Shelby
Collins	Inhofe	Smith (NH)
Conrad	Inouye	Smith (OR)
Coverdell	Johnson	Smith (OR)
Craig	Kerrey	Snowe
Crapo	Kerry	Thomas
Domenici	Kyl	Thompson
Dorgan	Leahy	Thurmond
Edwards	Levin	Torricelli
Enzi	Lieberman	Voinovich
Feinstein	Lincoln	Warner

NAYS—29

Akaka	Durbin	Murkowski
Baucus	Feingold	Murray
Boxer	Harkin	Reed
Breaux	Jeffords	Reid
Byrd	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Chafee	Kohl	Specter
Cleland	Landrieu	Stevens
Daschle	Lautenberg	Wellstone
DeWine	McCain	Wyden
Dodd	Mikulski	

The motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 77) was agreed to.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I move lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, it is not my intention to object, but there is a matter to clear up with the leadership, if I may have 30 seconds.

Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. My preference is to continue the quorum call. I understand it has been agreed to by my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will continue to call the roll.

The legislative clerk continued with the call of the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the Senator from Texas, Mrs. HUTCHISON, is recognized to offer an amendment relative to Kosovo.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that matter be

set aside and that the Senator from Arkansas be recognized for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. LINCOLN. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

NATIONAL WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to National Women's History Month. I am proud to have the privilege of being the youngest woman ever elected to serve in this great body. And I want to use the occasion of Women's History Month to recognize just a few women from Arkansas who are paving roads for others to follow. I want to thank the many women who have blazed trails for years before me in order to secure a more prominent role for women of all professions, race, or faiths. In my home state of Arkansas, there are many such examples of women who deserve notoriety.

Judge Bernice Kizer of Fort Smith was one of the first 5 women to enroll in the University of Arkansas Law School. After a brief time in private practice, she was elected to represent Sebastian County in our state legislature. During her tenure in the Arkansas General Assembly, Judge Kizer had the distinction of being appointed the first woman chairman of any legislative committee and the first woman member of the Legislative Council. She served in that capacity for 14 years, and then returned home to Sebastian County to become the first woman elected a judge in my home state of Arkansas. Judge Kizer's accomplishments are even more monumental when you understand that over the course of her 33 year career in public service, she was elected by Arkansans on 10 separate occasions without ever accepting one single campaign contribution. At the age of 83, Judge Kizer still serves as an active member of the Sebastian County Democratic Party. Judge Kizer paved the way for so many Arkansas women who are now involved in either the legislative or judicial branches of our government. On the Arkansas Supreme Court, Justice Annabelle Clinton Imber holds one of the courts seven seats. Secretary of State Sharon Priest and State Treasurer Jimmie Lou Fisher serve as two of Arkansas' constitutional officers. Today, Arkansas has 20 women who serve in our legislature.

Community service and philanthropy are two vital components of life in many of the small rural communities in Arkansas and women have helped lead the way to improve our quality of life. My home State of Arkansas ranks third in the nation for philanthropic giving. The gifts given to the people of Arkansas have consisted of civic centers, art centers, and classroom equipment just to name a few by women like Helen Walton, Bess Stephens, and Bernice Jones. These gifts have had a significant impact on the lives of all of

the areas residents. Whether it be insuring a warm meal to a hungry child in the early morning or after school activities, these women have looked beyond their own world and reached out to others in need. My mother has always told me that the kindest thing you can do for someone is to do something nice for their children. And as a young mother, believing that to be true, I am grateful to these and all community activists who take the time to care for the less fortunate.

Numerous Arkansas women have ventured into previously uncharted territories and established themselves as leaders in the business communities. These women, like Patti Upton, founder of Aromatique, Inc. have served as an inspiration to our state's growing number of young women who want to pursue business careers. Patti, who began this home fragrance endeavor in her kitchen in 1982, has turned a personal hobby into an inspiring professional growth opportunity. As the current President and CEO of what has become one of the nation's leading home fragrance companies, Patti has most recently begun to share her success with the rest of the State. Under her leadership, Aromatique created a line of products that include potpourri, candles, soaps and other products that are appropriately named "The Natural State." All proceeds from this product line go to support the Arkansas Nature Conservancy and recently Aromatique surpassed the million dollar mark for contributions back to this civic organization.

Arkansas is the home of other women who have had dramatic effects in the business world. Diane Heuter is President and CEO of St. Vincent Health System and Julia Peck Mobley is CEO of Commercial National Bank in Texarkana.

Mr. President, I am so proud to be able to stand here today in this historic Chamber and proclaim my full support and participation in National Women's History Month. There is no doubt that women across this Nation have made very significant contributions to our lives. Sometimes those contributions are subtle and some times they are significant, but none the less worthy of recognition. Let us celebrate the invention of bullet proof vests, fire escapes, or wind shield wipers, all of which can be credited to women in our history, as ways to promote and encourage women of future generations to rise to the level of success that I have spoken of here today. From this great Chamber, to State legislative chambers, from the boardroom to the classroom, from corporate headquarters to local Head Start, women make a difference.

I am grateful for the opportunity afforded to me by those who have gone before me, and I hope in my tenure in the United States Senate to pave the way for many more young women from the great State of Arkansas.

I yield back the remainder of my time. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the matter of the order governing the amendment of the Senator from Texas be set aside so that I may offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 80

(Purpose: To defer section 8 assistance for expiring contracts until October 1, 1999)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] proposes an amendment numbered 80.

Inset on page 43, after line 15:

“PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING

“HOUSING CERTIFICATE FUND

“(DEFERRAL)

“Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 105-276 for use in connection with expiring or terminating section 8 contracts, \$350,000,000 shall not become available until October 1, 1999.”

On page 42, strike beginning with line 10 through the end of line 21.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this is an amendment that deals with the provision in the bill that was reported from the committee that deferred spending from the temporary assistance to needy families account.

This will defer, instead, monies from the section 8 fund of HUD. There is approximately \$1.2 billion in that account. This will defer for 1 year the use of \$350 million in that account. It replaces the TANF amendment in the bill. Under that amendment, we deferred until 2001 the availability of funds which are transferred to the States.

Because of the misunderstanding about that fund, I want to explain why we use that fund in the first place. I am once again alarmed over the misinformation that has been spread by some people in that entity, that agency, to try and make it look like somehow or other we took monies away from States or any specific State.

In the first place, these grant awards are made quarterly. Actual cash outlays are made, but they are not transferred to the States until the States make expenditures in their TANF programs, the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families. In other words, the States first make the payments, and we pay it back. Some people, in the House in particular, have said this a way that the States can use this money for a piggy bank. In no way can they take this money and put it into another bank account and draw interest on it if they comply with the law. That

is one report I have heard—that we are preventing States from taking the money to put it into their own accounts.

We checked and we found that there was between \$3 billion and \$3.5 billion at the close of fiscal year 1998 in this fund. There are two quarters that have not even been distributed yet of this fiscal year 1999. And it is clear that the States have spent some money, and there is plenty of money to meet the States' expenditures and their requests for reimbursement of those expenditures. But this is not a fund that the States can come to willy-nilly and transfer the funds to their accounts.

Secondly, Mr. President, we deferred this money from obligation in this fiscal year—really until 2001, October 1, 2001.

The States would not—the bill that was reported from the committee—lose any of their funds. We, pursuant to the entitlement that was authorized, agreed that Federal funds, taxpayers' funds, in the amount of \$16.5 billion, from 1997 through 2002, would be placed in this account, to be available to reimburse States for the expenditures they made for Assistance to Needy Families.

Nothing in what the Appropriations Committee did harmed that program at all. But because by October 1 another \$16.5 billion would have been added to \$3 billion to \$3.5 billion in that account—and there has never been a drawdown at the rate that would make those funds needed within that period of time.

This is not a rainy day fund. We have been told that some people have said that States take these monies and put them in a rainy day fund to use at a later date. But the law says they can only get them to reimburse expenditures. If the administration is allowing this fund to be used as a rainy day account or a piggy bank account, it is wrong.

We have had so many calls from so many States, including my own. And I see the Senator from New York is here, and I know that they have been besieged because of their population base. Of course, they are eligible for more money from this account, more than anyone other than California. But it depends on how much they spend before they can get it back.

We made the decision to offset this bill. This is the first time we have offset totally a supplemental emergency bill. I have said to our committee, we ought to offset emergency funds with prior appropriated emergency funds and nonemergency funds with non-emergency prior appropriated funds. I think we are going to have a little discussion about that here on the floor.

But clearly what we have done, Mr. President, is we have used this bill to reprogram prior appropriated funds. These funds that were appropriated to the TANF account are sitting there waiting for the States to spend money and then come and ask for it to be re-

paid. The process is so rapid that the administration has not paid the first two quarters of this year yet. So this is not something we have interfered with by deferring money until the second fiscal year. Because, as I said, this account would get \$16.5 billion credited to it on October 1.

What we have done is, in order to avoid this controversy—and we do not need a controversy on this bill. We need to get it done. This bill, in my opinion, is a very important bill. It will provide money for assistance because of a great natural disaster in a neighboring country in this hemisphere. The President asked us to declare that an emergency. We have taken the declaration of emergency through as far as the outlay categories are concerned, because it is very difficult to score under the budget process outlays that come from emergency accounts.

We have not taken an emergency declaration through on those things that we believe are nonemergency in terms of the authorization process. So by that I mean, I fail to understand how we should extend the concept of emergency appropriations to natural disasters off our shores. We should be able to find the money, if we want to be good humanitarian members of this hemisphere, to assist our neighbors.

I believe we should assist them. But I do not believe we should use the laws that were intended to demand taxpayers' funds immediately to meet natural disasters or declared emergencies by the President of the United States within the boundaries of our United States.

So Mr. President, I offer this amendment in the spirit of compromise, to try and take away this battle that I saw coming over the use of TANF funds. No one supports the concepts of this Temporary Assistance to Needy Families. We all know it replaced the old Aid to Families with Dependent Children, the AFDC program, that assisted so many States, including mine for so many years.

But this now is a block grant program that works in conjunction with the welfare-to-work concepts, and that is very vital for the States. We know that. And I think the fear that was engendered in those States that somehow or other we might not keep the commitment that was made, that if they make those expenditures we would repay them according to the formula under the law that was passed in 1996, the Welfare Reform Act, is unfortunate and wrong.

I hope that someone in the administration is listening. One of these days I will find some way to tweak the nose of the people who keep doing this, because they did it in the terms of border guards last week, and now they are doing it in terms of the States themselves in terms of the comments that have been made that somehow or other we were taking money that the States were entitled to; we were deferring money that they were entitled to,